

Claims 1-5, 8, 10, 12 and 15 are pending in this application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 8 and 12 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 3,623,626, hereinafter entitled "Bridges." The Examiner has further rejected claims 4 and 5 under 35 USC 103(a) over Bridges. In regard to claims 4 and 5 the Examiner has taken official notice that high-temperature superconducting cryogenic devices and the use of liquid nitrogen is well known. The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-5, 8, 10, 12 and 15 under Bridges in view of Segura (US Patent 3,339,78) and de Chazal (US Patent 5,873,762).

Status identifiers have been added to claims 2, 3 and 4 as required. It is noted that the Examiner has accepted proposed drawing changes for figures 6 and 7.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 8 and 12 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bridges. Bridges does not teach or suggest a securing structure that minimizes horizontal and lateral movements using the base securing means, and preventing rotational movement about a vertical axis by using at least one side support component as recited in the presently amended claims while at the same time minimizing surface area of securing means to reduce temperature transfer from the inner vessel to the outer vessel. Rather Bridges teaches a structure for supporting tanks housed in the holds of ships, wherein the tanks serve to transport cargo in a ship that experiences relatively high or relatively low temperatures, wherein the tanks, as a consequence, are subject to substantial contractions and expansions. The supporting arms are designed to allow relative movement of the tank about an axis at pivot 18, that may be caused by temperature changes in the hold and yet keep the tanks from excessive movement. See for example, column 1, lines 58-59 and column 2, lines 7-13.

Whereas, in the present invention, a structure is provided to minimize non-thermal expansion related movement in the three axis while at the same time minimizing the surface area of the securing members to minimize heat conduction from the inner vessel to the outer vessel. See, for example, paragraph 16 of the Specification. Accordingly, a limitation has been added to claim 1 which recites the restriction of movement in the rotational axis about the vertical axis and a surface area of the securing means selected to minimize the surface area to the outer vessel so as to minimize temperature transfer between the inner and outer vessel. Since claim 4, depends from now amended claim 1 it is likewise not anticipated by Bridges. Claim 8 has been amended to recite means for preventing lateral movement between the inner and outer vessel and a surface area of the means selected to minimize the surface area to the outer vessel to minimize

temperature transfer between the inner and outer vessel. Claim 15 has been cancelled.

Consequently, Applicant contends that the present invention as recited in claims 1-3, 8 and 12 is not anticipated by Bridges, thus obviating the current rejection under 102(b). It is believed that newly amended claims 1, 3-, 8, and 12 are now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4 and 5 under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Bridges. Bridges does not suggest or teach the use of liquid nitrogen in a cryogenic cooling chamber. The Examiner has identified the reference Segura having a cryogenic cooling system in a tanker. The Examiner has taken official notice that it would be obvious to combine liquid nitrogen as a cooling medium in a cryogenic system in the invention disclosed in Bridges, however, neither reference provides a teaching or suggestion to combine liquid nitrogen as a cooling medium in a cryogenic cooling system with the invention disclosed in Bridges. It is improper outside a teaching or suggestion to make the combination. As such, Applicant contends that a 103(a) rejection of claims 4 and 5 under Bridges is improper. Consequently, it is believed that dependent claims 4 and 5 are in condition for allowance.


Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 8, 10, 12 and 15 under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridges in view of Segura and de Chazal. Claims 2, 10 and 15 have been canceled. For the reasons articulated above it is believed that newly amended claims 1 and 8 are patentable over Bridges, in view of Segura. Since claims 3-5, and 10 depend from either claims 1 and 8 it is believed that they are also patentable. Claims 10 and 15 have been cancelled, as such, it is believed that any rejection in view of de Chazal has been obviated. Claims 1, 3-5, 8 and 12 are thus in condition for allowance.

It is therefore, requested that the present patent application now be allowed.

Alternatively, applicant respectfully request that this amendment be admitted to place the claims in better from for appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 5, 2006


George L. Rideout, Jr. Reg. No. 43,880

Law Office of George L Rideout, Jr.
4400 Abbott Grove Drive
Crestwood, KY 40014
Phone (502) 452-7792
Fax (502) 241-5039
Email: grideout@bellsouth.net